An optimal discrimination of two mixed qubit states with a fixed rate of inconclusive results

Donghoon Ha and Younghun Kwon*
Department of Applied Physics, Hanyang University, Ansan, Kyunggi-Do, 425-791, South Korea
(Dated: August 10, 2016)

In this paper we consider the optimal discrimination of two mixed qubit states for a measurement that allows a fixed rate of inconclusive results(FRIR). Our strategy for the problem is to transform the FRIR of two qubit states into a minimum error discrimination for three qubit states by adding a specific quantum state ρ_0 and a prior probability q_0(which we will call an inconclusive degree), which we name the modified FRIR problem. First, we investigate special inconclusive degrees $q_0^{(0)}$ and $q_0^{(1)}$, which appear naturally in the modified FRIR problem and are the beginning and the end of practical interval of inconclusive degree, and find the analytic form of them. Next, we show that the modified FRIR problem can be classified into two cases $q_0 = q_0^{(0)}$(or $q_0 = q_0^{(1)}$) and $q_0^{(0)} < q_0 < q_0^{(1)}$. In fact, by maximum confidences of two qubit states and non-diagonal element of ρ_0, the modified FRIR problem is completely understood. Then, we provide an analytic solution of the FRIR problem when $q_0 = q_0^{(0)}$(or $q_0 = q_0^{(1)}$). However, when $q_0^{(0)} < q_0 < q_0^{(1)}$, we rather supply the numerical method to find the solution, because of the complex relation between inconclusive degree and corresponding failure probability. Finally we confirm our results using previously known examples.

arXiv:1608.02695v1 [quant-ph] 9 Aug 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

The information encoded in the quantum state by a sender can be delivered to a receiver, who performs a measurement to extract this information. A proper measurement strategy is required when the receiver wants to obtain information from nonorthogonal quantum states because those states cannot be perfectly discriminated[1–4]. Measurement strategies can be classified by the constraints on conclusive or inconclusive results. In quantum state discrimination, inconclusive results indicate that the given quantum state cannot be definitely discriminated. Minimum-error discrimination(MD)[5–16] is able to minimize the average error of conclusive results without inconclusive results. Unambiguous discrimination[17–27] and maximum-confidence discrimination[28] strategies permit inconclusive results and minimize individual errors associated with the conclusive results.

In addition to these strategies, there is a scheme for minimizing the average error of conclusive results while maintaining a fixed rate of inconclusive results(FRIR)[29–36]. FRIR is actually a generalization of other known strategies. For example, when the fixed rate is zero, the FRIR is equivalent to the MD. If the fixed rate is sufficiently large, the FRIR becomes equivalent to maximum-confidence discrimination(or unambiguous discrimination). For the MD, the solution of two mixed quantum states is explicitly known[5, 10], however it is not known for the FRIR. The solution of the FRIR of two qubit states with identical maximal confidences exists[33] but that of the general case does not.

Recently, Bagan *et al.*[34] changed the FRIR of N quantum states into the MD of N quantum states by modifying prior probabilities and the quantum states. This approach can be useful for obtaining a solution to symmetric states but it cannot be used for arbitrary quantum states and prior probabilities because it requires solving complicated equations. Nakahira *et al.*[35] and Herzog[36] provided another method to transform the FRIR into the MD. Their method does not modify the given quantum states or the prior probabilities. Instead, this method only adds an appropriate density operator ρ_0 with a suitable probability q_0(which we will call an inconclusive degree) for a given quantum system. Then, based on the FRIR of N quantum states, one can form the MD of $N+1$ quantum states by using a measurement operator that provides inconclusive results. They mentioned the relation between failure probability of original problem and inconclusive degree of modified problem. However they could not find special inconclusive degrees $q_0^{(0)}$ and $q_0^{(1)}$ in an analytic form, which appear naturally in modified problem. Even more they could not solve even the simplest FRIR problem for two qubit mixed states. Here special inconclusive degrees $q_0^{(0)}$ and $q_0^{(1)}$ are the beginning and the end of practical interval of inconclusive degree. In fact even through $q_0^{(0)}$ and $q_0^{(1)}$ are the key to solve FRIR of two qubit states, it is difficult to find them in an analytic form.

In this paper we analyze the FRIR of two mixed qubit states, whose solution is not yet known. Our strategy is to analyze the modified FRIR problem(MD of three qubit states) equivalent to the original FRIR problem(FRIR of

*Electronic address: yyhkwon@hanyang.ac.kr

two qubit states). In Section II we derive the detailed relation between original FRIR problem and modified FRIR problem. We transform the variables of original problem into new ones, which can be useful in modified problem. Furthermore we introduce special inconclusive degrees $q_0^{(0)}$ and $q_0^{(1)}$ and investigate their feature. In Section III we divide FRIR problem of two qubit states into two cases of $q_0 = q_0^{(0)}$(or $q_0 = q_0^{(1)}$) and $q_0^{(0)} < q_0 < q_0^{(1)}$, and specify maximum confidences of two qubit states and the non-diagonal element of ρ_0. Using complementarity problem, we find the analytic form of $q_0^{(0)}$ and $q_0^{(1)}$, and provide the complete understanding of modified FRIR problem in $q_0^{(0)} \leq q_0 \leq q_0^{(1)}$. That is, we provide an analytic solution of original FRIR problem in case of $q_0 = q_0^{(0)}$(or $q_0 = q_0^{(1)}$). If $q_0^{(0)} < q_0 < q_0^{(1)}$, because of complex relation between inconclusive degree and corresponding failure probability, we provide the method to solve original problem numerically. Finally, we confirm our results by providing the correct solutions to known examples[33]. In Section IV we summarize our result.

II. FRIR

We consider the quantum state ensemble $\{q_i, \rho_i\}_{i=1}^N$. This ensemble suggests that with the prior probability q_i, one prepares the quantum state corresponding to the density operator ρ_i on a d-dimensional complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_d$. Without loss of generality, we assume that the eigenvectors of $\rho_0 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N q_i\rho_i$ (with nonzero eigenvalues) span $\mathcal{H}_d$. The quantum state of the system may be discriminated by the positive operator valued measure (POVM) $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^N$. The POVM consists of $N+1$ positive semidefinite Hermitian operators on $\mathcal{H}_d$ and satisfies $\sum_{i=0}^N M_i = I_d$. I_d is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_d$. Here M_0 provides inconclusive results, while $M_{i(\neq 0)}$ gives conclusive results. The probability that the quantum state ρ_i can be guessed to be ρ_j is $\mathrm{tr}[\rho_i M_j]$ by the Born rule. Therefore, the probability for conclusive results P_C turns out to be $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathrm{tr}[\rho_0 M_i]$, and the probability for inconclusive results P_I becomes $\mathrm{tr}[\rho_0 M_0]$. The probability of correctly guessing the quantum state and the error probability are $P_\mathrm{cor} = \sum_{i=1}^N q_i \mathrm{tr}[\rho_i M_i]$ and $P_\mathrm{err} = P_\mathrm{C} - P_\mathrm{cor}$ respectively. We use $R_{\mathrm{cor(err)}}$ to denote the probability of correctly(or incorrectly) guessing when we succeed in guessing the quantum state. That is, $R_{\mathrm{cor(err)}} = P_{\mathrm{cor(err)}}/P_\mathrm{C}$.

A. Original FRIR problem

Our discrimination strategy is to maximize(or minimize) $R_{\mathrm{cor(err)}}$ with fixed $P_\mathrm{I} = Q(0 \leq Q < 1)$. Because $P_\mathrm{C} + P_\mathrm{I} = 1$, this is equivalent to maximizing(or minimizing) $P_{\mathrm{cor(err)}}$ with fixed $P_\mathrm{I} = Q$, which can be reformulated into the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & P_\mathrm{cor} = \sum_{i=1}^N q_i \mathrm{tr}[\rho_i M_i] \\ \text{subject to} \quad & M_i \geq 0 \ \forall i, \ \sum_{i=0}^N M_i = I_d, \ \mathrm{tr}[\rho_0 M_0] = Q. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In this paper, we use the superscript "opt" to denote the optimized value or variable. For example, $P_\mathrm{cor}^\mathrm{opt}(Q)$ and $R_\mathrm{cor}^\mathrm{opt}(Q)$ indicate the maximum of P_cor and R_cor when $P_\mathrm{I} = Q$, respectively.

B. Modified FRIR problem

Instead of simply attacking the problem as described above, we can modify it as follows. Here, we introduce a positive number q_0(called an inconclusive degree) which corresponds to the a priori probability of ρ_0. Further, M_0 denotes the measurement operator of guessing ρ_0 in the system:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \bar{P}_\mathrm{cor} \equiv \sum_{i=0}^N q_i \mathrm{tr}[\rho_i M_i] \\ \text{subject to} \quad & M_i \geq 0 \ \forall i, \ \sum_{i=0}^N M_i = I_d, \ q_0 = q. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

We use $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$ to denote the maximum value of $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}$ when $q_0 = q$.

The following relation[35] between $P_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$ and $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$ implies that when the MD of $\{q_i, \rho_i\}_{i=0}^N$ can be completely analyzed, $R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$ can be found in the FRIR of $\{q_i, \rho_i\}_{i=1}^N$.

Lemma II.1 *If $P_{\rm I} = Q$ and $\bar{P}_{\rm cor} = \bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$ for some POVM, $P_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q) = \bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q) - qQ$.*

Proof. Suppose that when $\{q_i, \rho_i\}_{i=1}^N$ is given, POVM $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^N$ can cause $P_{\rm I} = Q$ and $\bar{P}_{\rm cor} = \bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$. It follows that the POVM can make $P_{\rm cor}(Q) = \bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q) - qQ$. If there exists a POVM that can build $P_{\rm I} = Q$ and $P_{\rm cor}(Q) = P > \bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q) - qQ$, it can also construct $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}(q) = P + qQ$. However since $P + qQ$ is larger than $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$, this is contradictory. Therefore $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^N$ should produce $P_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$, which means $P_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q) = \bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q) - qQ$. ■

C. Optimality conditions of modified FRIR problem

The optimization problem (2) is equivalent to MD of $\{q_i, \rho_i\}_{i=0}^N$ with non-normalized priori probabilities. Since the semidefinite programming of MD[37] hold regardless of the normalization condtion, we can apply the results into this modified FRIR problem. First, the modified problem has the following dual problem.

$$\min \quad {\rm tr}[K] \quad \text{subject to} \quad K = q_i\rho_i + r_i\tau_i \ \forall i, \ q_0 = q. \tag{3}$$

r_i is a non-negative number and τ_i is a density operator on $\mathcal{H}_d$. Second, the optimized values of two problems (2),(3) of $q_0 = q$ coincide. Finally, the complementary slackness condition $r_i{\rm tr}[\tau_i M_i] = 0 (\forall i)$ is a necessary and sufficient condition for optimizing the feasible variables in two problems(primal and dual problems)(2),(3) of $q_0 = q$. We summarize the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) optimality conditions[38] for modified FRIR problem of $q_0 = q$ as follows:

$$\text{(i) } M_i \geq 0 \ \forall i, \ \sum_{i=0}^N M_i = I_d, \ \text{(ii) } q\rho_0 + r_0\tau_0 = q_i\rho_i + r_i\tau_i \ \forall i, \ \text{(iii) } r_i{\rm tr}[\tau_i M_i] = 0 \ \forall i. \tag{4}$$

In order to express KKT optimality condition (4) in a form that we can deal with, we define the following variables.

$$\bar{M}_i = \rho_0^{1/2} M_i \rho_0^{1/2}, \ \bar{\rho}_i = \rho_0^{-1/2} q_i \rho_i \rho_0^{-1/2}, \ \bar{\tau}_i = \rho_0^{-1/2} r_i \tau_i \rho_0^{-1/2}. \tag{5}$$

In terms of these newly defined variables, the KKT condition can be rewritten as:

$$\text{(i) } \bar{M}_i \geq 0 \ \forall i, \ \sum_{i=0}^N \bar{M}_i = \rho_0, \ \text{(ii) } qI_d + \bar{\tau}_0 = \bar{\rho}_i + \bar{\tau}_i \ \forall i, \ \text{(iii) } {\rm tr}[\bar{\tau}_i \bar{M}_i] = 0 \ \forall i. \tag{6}$$

We denote C_i and $|\nu_i\rangle$ as the largest eigenvalue of $\bar{\rho}_i$ and the corresponding eigenvector, respectively. C_i physically represents the maximum achievable confidence of ρ_i in terms of the maximum-confidence discrimination[28]. Note that the product $r_i^{\rm opt}\tau_i^{\rm opt}$ of $r_i^{\rm opt}$ and $\tau_i^{\rm opt}$ satisfying optimality condition (4) is unique, but optimal POVM elements $M_i^{\rm opt}$ is not always unique[14]. $\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt}$ fulfilling another optimality condition (6) is unique. However $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ can be unique or non-unique. We will use the fact to find the analytic expression of optimal POVM element $M_i^{\rm opt}$ or $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$.

When $d = 2$, by introducing a real number p_i and Bloch vectors $\boldsymbol{u}_i$, $\boldsymbol{v}_i$, and $\boldsymbol{w}_i$, we can express POVM elements M_i and density operators ρ_i, τ_i as:

$$M_i = p_i(I_2 + \boldsymbol{u}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}), \ \rho_i = \frac{1}{2}(I_2 + \boldsymbol{v}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}), \ \tau_i = \frac{1}{2}(I_2 + \boldsymbol{w}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}). \tag{7}$$

Then, the KKT optimality condition (4) can be described as:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{(i)} \quad p_i \geq 0 \ \forall i, \ \sum_{i=0}^N p_i = 1, \ \sum_{i=0}^N p_i \boldsymbol{u}_i = 0, \\ &\text{(ii)} \quad q + r_0 = q_i + r_i, \ q\boldsymbol{v}_0 + r_0\boldsymbol{w}_0 = q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i + r_i\boldsymbol{w}_i \ \forall i, \\ &\text{(iii)} \quad p_i r_i (1 + \boldsymbol{u}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{w}_i) = 0 \ \forall i. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

In Section III we investigate optimal variables of primal problem (2) and dual problem(3), using two optimality conditions (6) and (8). The approach is called complementarity problem[13, 14] in semidefinite programming.

D. Special inconclusive degrees

The fact that optimal measurement may not be unique in the MD leads us to introduce the following definition.

Definition II.1 *When q is a positive number, we define $P_{\rm I}(q)$ as follows:*

$$P_{\rm I}(q)=\left\{{\rm tr}[\rho_0 M_0] : M_i\geq 0\ \forall i,\ \sum_{i=0}^{N} M_i = I_d,\ q{\rm tr}[\rho_0 M_0]+\sum_{i=1}^{N} q_i {\rm tr}[\rho_i M_i]=\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)\right\}. \tag{9}$$

The case of $Q\geq(=)a$ for any $Q\in P_{\rm I}(q)$ will be denoted as $P_{\rm I}(q)\geq(=)a$, whereas that of $Q\geq(=)Q'$ for any $Q\in P_{\rm I}(q)$ and $Q'\in P_{\rm I}(q')$ will be written as $P_{\rm I}(q)\geq(=)P_{\rm I}(q')$. Note that $0\leq P_{\rm I}(q)\leq 1$ for any q.

The following lemma shows how $P_{\rm I}(q)$ behaves as q increases.

Lemma II.2 *$P_{\rm I}(q)$ is a convex set for any q, and $P_{\rm I}(q)\leq P_{\rm I}(q')$ for any q, q' with $q<q'$.*

Proof. Assume that when $\{q_i,\rho_i\}_{i=1}^N$ is given, the POVM $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^N(\{M_i'\}_{i=0}^N)$ can produce $P_{\rm I}=Q$ and $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}=\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)(P_{\rm I}=Q'$ and $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}=\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q'))$. If $q=q'$ and $Q<Q'$, the POVM $\{M_i''\}_{i=0}^N$ composed of $M_i''=pM_i+(1-p)M_i'(0\leq p\leq 1)$ will build $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}=\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$ and $P_{\rm I}=pQ+(1-p)Q'$. Therefore $P_{\rm I}(q)$ becomes a convex set.

Now suppose that $q<q'$. $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^N$ constructs $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}=(q'-q)Q+\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$ when $q_0=q'$, and the value should be equal to or less than $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q')=(q'-q)Q'+\bar{P}$, where $\bar{P}$ is $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}$ corresponding to $\{M_i'\}_{i=0}^N$ when $q_0=q$. This means that $(Q'-Q)\geq(\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)-\bar{P})/(q'-q)$. Therefore we have $Q\leq Q'$. This means that $P_{\rm I}(q)\leq P_{\rm I}(q')$. ■

Lemma II.2 enables us to define the following special inconclusive degrees.

Definition II.2 (special inconclusive degrees) *We define $q_0^{(0)}, q_0^{(1)}$ as follows:*

$$q_0^{(0)}=\max\{q>0 : 0\in P_{\rm I}(q)\},\ q_0^{(1)}=\min\{q>0 : 1\in P_{\rm I}(q)\}. \tag{10}$$

This implies that a proper inconclusive degree q, which satisfies $0<P_{\rm I}(q)<1$, exists in the region $[q_0^{(0)}, q_0^{(1)}]$. Therefore, $R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$ in $0\leq Q<1$ can be found from $P_{\rm I}(q)$ and $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$ in $q_0^{(0)}\leq q\leq q_0^{(1)}$. That is,

$$R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)=\frac{\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)-qQ}{1-Q}\quad \forall Q\in P_{\rm I}(q). \tag{11}$$

The following lemma provides the lower bound of $q_0^{(0)}$ and the upper bound of $q_0^{(1)}$.

Lemma II.3 *$q_0^{(0)}\geq 1/N$ and $q_0^{(1)}\leq \max_i C_i$.*

Proof. When $q_0<1/N$, we get $\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt}=(1/N-q_0)I_d+(1/N)\sum_{i=1}^N\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt}$ by (ii) of (6). If we multiply $\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}$ to both sides of the equation and take the trace of the result, we obtain $(1/N-q_0){\rm tr}[\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}]\leq 0$ by (iii) and the positivity of $\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt}(\forall i)$. From the assumption on q_0, $\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}$ should be zero and we find $P_{\rm I}(q)=0(\forall q<1/N)$. Therefore using lemma II.2, we have $q_0^{(0)}\geq 1/N$.

When $C=\max_i C_i$, $\bar{M}_i=\delta_{i0}\rho_0$ and $\bar{\tau}_i=CI_d-\bar{\rho}_i$ satisfy the optimality condition (6) of $q_0=C$, and $1\in P_{\rm I}(C)$. Therefore we get $q_0^{(1)}\leq C$ by lemma II.2. ■

III. MAIN RESULT: FRIR OF TWO QUBIT MIXED STATES

In this section we analyze the FRIR of two qubit-mixed states($d=N=2$), using KKT optimality conditions (6) or (8). In this case, since $|\nu_1\rangle$ and $|\nu_2\rangle$ are orthogonal, $\bar{\rho}_1$ and $\bar{\rho}_2$ become:

$$\bar{\rho}_1=C_1|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|+(1-C_2)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ \bar{\rho}_2=(1-C_1)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|+C_2|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|. \tag{12}$$

We assume $C_1\leq C_2$, which does not spoil generality of the problem. Here e denotes the difference between q_1 and q_2, and l expresses the distance between two weighted Bloch vectors $q_1\boldsymbol{v}_1$ and $q_2\boldsymbol{v}_2$.

$$e=|q_1-q_2|,\ l=\|q_1\boldsymbol{v}_1-q_2\boldsymbol{v}_2\|_2. \tag{13}$$

A. FRIR at $P_{\rm I} = Q$ for all $Q \in P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(1)})$

In the following lemma modified FRIR problem to the case of $q_0 = C_2$ is completely analyzed.

Lemma III.1 *$\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(C_2)$ is C_2. When $C_1 = C_2$, $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ to $q_0 = C_2$ is expressed as*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \rho_0 - \alpha|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| - \beta|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = \alpha|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = \beta|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \\ 0 \le \alpha \le \rho_{11},\ 0 \le \beta \le \rho_{22},\ (\rho_{11}-\alpha)(\rho_{22}-\beta) \ge |\rho_{12}|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where

$$\rho_{ij} = \langle\nu_i|\rho_0|\nu_j\rangle. \tag{15}$$

Then $P_{\rm I}(C_2)$ becomes

$$P_{\rm I}(C_2) = \begin{cases} [Q_1, 1] & \text{if } \rho_{11} < |\rho_{12}| \le \rho_{22}, \\ [Q_2, 1] & \text{if } \rho_{22} < |\rho_{12}| \le \rho_{11}, \\ [2|\rho_{12}|, 1] & \text{if } |\rho_{12}| \le \rho_{11}, \rho_{22}, \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

where

$$Q_i = \rho_{ii} + \frac{|\rho_{12}|^2}{\rho_{ii}}. \tag{17}$$

However when $C_1 < C_2$, $P_{\rm I}(C_2)$ becomes $[Q_1, 1]$, and $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ for $q_0 = C_2$ is expressed as

$$\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \rho_0 - \beta|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = 0,\ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = \beta|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ 0 \le \beta \le 1 - Q_1. \tag{18}$$

Proof. When $q_0 = C_2$, since $\{\bar{M}_i = \delta_{i0}\rho_0\}_{i=0}^2$ and $\{\bar{\tau}_i^\star = C_2 I_2 - \bar{\rho}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ satisfy the KKT optimality condition (6), $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(C_2) = C_2$. This means that $\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt} = \bar{\tau}_i^\star (\forall i)$. Since the rank of $\bar{\tau}_2^{\rm opt}$ should be one by $C_1 + C_2 > 1$, we have $\bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = \beta|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|$ from (iii). The form of $\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}$ and $\bar{M}_1^{\rm opt}$ can be classified into the cases of $C_1 = C_2$ and $C_1 < C_2$.

If $C_1 = C_2$, the rank of $\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt}$ becomes 1, and we get $\bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = \alpha|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|$ from (iii). Furthermore (i) indicates that $\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \rho_0 - \alpha|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| - \beta|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|$, $0 \le \alpha \le \rho_{11}$, $0 \le \beta \le \rho_{22}$, and $(\rho_{11}-\alpha)(\rho_{22}-\beta) \ge |\rho_{12}|^2$. Since ${\rm tr}[\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}] = 1 - \alpha - \beta$, the maximum can be found at $\alpha = \beta = 0$. α and β corresponding to its minimum can be different. When $\rho_{11} < |\rho_{12}| \le \rho_{22}$, we have $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta = 1 - Q_1$. When $\rho_{22} < |\rho_{12}| \le \rho_{11}$, we obtain $\alpha = 1 - Q_2$ and $\beta = 0$. When $|\rho_{12}| \le \rho_{11}, \rho_{22}$, we have $\alpha = \rho_{11} - |\rho_{12}|$ and $\beta = \rho_{22} - |\rho_{12}|$. Therefore $P_{\rm I}(C_2)$ becomes (16).

If $C_1 < C_2$, the rank of $\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt}$ becomes 2, and (iii) implies that $\bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = 0$. Then (i) means $\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \rho_0 - \beta|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|$ and $0 \le \beta \le 1 - Q_1$. Since ${\rm tr}[\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}] = 1 - \beta$, the minimum(maximum) can be found at $\beta = 1 - Q_1 (\beta = 0)$. Therefore we get $P_{\rm I}(C_2) = [Q_1, 1]$. ■

Three real numbers Q_1, Q_2, and $2|\rho_{12}|$ are less than 1. Lemma III.1 can derive the following corollary.

Corollary III.1 (FRIR of $Q \in P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(1)})$) *$q_0^{(1)}$ is C_2, and $P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(1)})$ can be classified into*

$$P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(1)}) = \begin{cases} [Q_1, 1] & \text{if } C_1 < C_2, \\ [Q_1, 1] & \text{if } C_1 = C_2,\ \rho_{11} < |\rho_{12}| \le \rho_{22}, \\ [Q_2, 1] & \text{if } C_1 = C_2,\ \rho_{22} < |\rho_{12}| \le \rho_{11}, \\ [2|\rho_{12}|, 1] & \text{if } C_1 = C_2,\ |\rho_{12}| \le \rho_{11}, \rho_{22}. \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

$R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$ is C_2, and $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ of $P_{\rm I} = Q$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \epsilon|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| + \rho_{12}|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_2| + \rho_{21}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_1| + (Q-\epsilon)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \\ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = (\rho_{11}-\epsilon)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = (\rho_{22}-Q+\epsilon)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon = \rho_{11} \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad & \text{if } C_1 < C_2, \\ \max\left\{Q - \rho_{22}, \tfrac{Q}{2} - \sqrt{\tfrac{Q^2}{4} - |\rho_{12}|^2}\right\} \le \epsilon \le \min\left\{\rho_{11}, \tfrac{Q}{2} + \sqrt{\tfrac{Q^2}{4} - |\rho_{12}|^2}\right\} & \text{if } C_1 = C_2. \end{aligned}$$

The result implies that when $Q \in P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(1)})$, if $C_1 < C_2$, FRIR measurement to $P_{\rm I} = Q$ is unique, but when $C_1 = C_2$, it is not unique.

B. FRIR at $P_{\rm I} = Q$ for all $Q \in P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)})$

When $q_0 = q_0^{(0)}$, we classify modified FRIR problem into three cases, using two maximum confidences and the non-diagonal element ρ_{12} of ρ_0. Then we analyze the three cases completely. The first case is $C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} < C_2$, and the second one $\frac{1}{2} < C_1 \leq C_2, \rho_{12} = 0$. The third case is $\frac{1}{2} < C_1 \leq C_2$ and $\rho_{12} \neq 0$. The following lemma shows the complete analysis to modified FRIR problem in $C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} < C_2$ and $q_0 = 1 - C_1$.

Lemma III.2 *When $C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} < C_2$, $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(1-C_1)$ is q_2, and $P_{\rm I}(1-C_1)$ is $[0, 1-Q_2]$. If $C_1 < 1/2$, $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ to $q_0 = 1-C_1$ becomes*

$$\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \alpha|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = 0,\ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = \rho_0 - \alpha|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 - Q_2. \tag{21}$$

However if $C_1 = 1/2$, they can be expressed as

$$\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \alpha|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = \beta|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = \rho_0 - (\alpha+\beta)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \alpha, \beta \geq 0,\ \alpha + \beta \leq 1 - Q_2. \tag{22}$$

Proof. When $C_1 \leq 1/2 < C_2$, since $\{\bar{M}_i = \delta_{i2}\rho_0\}_{i=0}^2$ and the following $\{\bar{\tau}_i^\star\}_{i=0}^2$ satisfies the optimality condition (6) of $q_0 = 1 - C_1$, $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(1 - C_1) = q_2$.

$$\bar{\tau}_0^\star = (C_1 + C_2 - 1)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ \bar{\tau}_1^\star = (1 - 2C_1)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| + (2C_2 - 1)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ \bar{\tau}_2^\star = 0. \tag{23}$$

This implies that $\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt} = \bar{\tau}_i^\star (\forall i)$ when $q_0 = 1 - C_1$. Since the rank of $\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt}$ is 1 given that $C_1 + C_2 > 1$, (iii) implies $\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \alpha|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|$. However $\bar{M}_1^{\rm opt}$ and $\bar{M}_2^{\rm opt}$ are classified into cases where $C_1 < 1/2$ and $C_1 = 1/2$.

When $C_1 < 1/2$, since the rank of $\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt}$ becomes 2, (iii) gives $\bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = 0$ and (i) means $\bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = \rho_0 - \alpha|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 - Q_2$. Then, since $\mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}] = \alpha$ shows a minimum at $\alpha = 0$ and a maximum at $\alpha = 1 - Q_2$, we have $P_{\rm I}(1 - C_1) = [0, 1 - Q_2]$. However, when $C_1 = 1/2$, the rank of $\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt}$ is 1 and (iii) implies $\bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = \beta|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|$. Therefore (i) means $\bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = \rho_0 - (\alpha + \beta)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|$ and we have $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$, and $\alpha + \beta \leq 1 - Q_2$. $\mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}] = \alpha$ has a minimum(maximum) at $\alpha = 0 (\alpha = 1 - Q_2$ and $\beta = 0)$. Therefore, we obtain $P_{\rm I}(1 - C_1) = [0, 1 - Q_2]$. ■

Since $1 - Q_2$ is larger than zero, lemma III.2 implies the following corollary.

Corollary III.2 *When $C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} < C_2$, $q_0^{(0)}$ is $1 - C_1$, and $P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)})$ is $[0, 1 - Q_2]$. $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ for $P_{\rm I} = Q (\in P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)})$ can be expressed as*

$$\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = Q|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = \epsilon|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = (\rho_{11} - Q - \epsilon)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| + \rho_{12}|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_2| + \rho_{21}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_1| + \rho_{22}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \tag{24}$$

where

$$\begin{array}{rl} \epsilon = 0 & \text{if } C_1 < \frac{1}{2} < C_2, \\ 0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1 - Q_2 - Q & \text{if } C_1 = \frac{1}{2} < C_2. \end{array} \tag{25}$$

The result tells that when $Q \in P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)})$, if $C_1 < 1/2 < C_2$, FRIR measurement for $P_{\rm I} = Q$ is unique, but when $C_1 = 1/2 < C_2$ it is not unique.

The following lemma shows the solution to modified FRIR problem of $\frac{1}{2} < C_1 < C_2, \rho_{12} = 0, q_0 = C_1$.

Lemma III.3 *When $\frac{1}{2} < C_1 \leq C_2$ and $\rho_{12} = 0$, $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(C_1)$ becomes $\rho_{11}C_1 + \rho_{22}C_2$, and $P_{\rm I}(C_1)$ is $[0, \rho_{11} + \rho_{22}\delta_{C_1,C_2}]$. If $C_1 < C_2$, $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ for $q_0 = C_1$ is expressed as*

$$\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \alpha|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = (\rho_{11} - \alpha)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = \rho_{22}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ 0 \leq \alpha \leq \rho_{11}. \tag{26}$$

However, if $C_1 = C_2$, $P_{\rm I}(C_1)$ is $[0, 1]$. $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ for $q_0 = C_1$ is given by

$$\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \alpha|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| + \beta|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = (\rho_{11} - \alpha)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = (\rho_{22} - \beta)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ 0 \leq \alpha \leq \rho_{11}, 0 \leq \beta \leq \rho_{22}. \tag{27}$$

Proof. When $1/2 < C_1 \leq C_2, \rho_{12} = 0$, since the following $\{\bar{M}_i\}_{i=0}^2, \{\bar{\tau}_i^\star\}_{i=0}^2$ satisfies the optimality condition (6) of $q_0 = C_1$, $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(C_1) = \rho_{11}C_1 + \rho_{22}C_2$.

$$\begin{array}{c} \bar{M}_0 = 0,\ \bar{M}_1 = \rho_{11}|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \bar{M}_2 = \rho_{22}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \\ \bar{\tau}_0^\star = (C_2 - C_1)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ \bar{\tau}_1^\star = (2C_2 - 1)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ \bar{\tau}_2^\star = (2C_1 - 1)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|. \end{array} \tag{28}$$

This means that $\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt} = \bar{\tau}_i^{\star}(\forall i)$ when $q_0 = C_1$. Since, if $C_1 < C_2$, the rank of $\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt}$ is one, (iii) tells that $\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}$ and $\bar{M}_1^{\rm opt}$ are proportional to $|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|$, and $\bar{M}_2^{\rm opt}$ is proportional to $|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|$. By (i), $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ can be expressed as (26). However, since $C_1 = C_2$ implies $\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt} = 0$, $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ becomes (27). Therefore $P_{\rm I}(C_1)$ can be written as $[0, \rho_{11}+\rho_{22}\delta_{C_1,C_2}]$. ■

Since ρ_{11} is larger than zero, lemma III.3 induces the following corollary.

Corollary III.3 *When $\frac{1}{2} < C_1 \le C_2$ and $\rho_{12} = 0$, $q_0^{(0)}$ is C_1, and $P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)})$ becomes $[0, \rho_{11} + \rho_{22}\delta_{C_1,C_2}]$. $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ of $P_{\rm I} = Q(\in P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)}))$ is expressed as*

$$\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = (Q-\epsilon)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| + \epsilon|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = (\rho_{11} - Q + \epsilon)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|,\ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = (\rho_{22}-\epsilon)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \tag{29}$$

where

$$\begin{array}{cc} \epsilon = 0 & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < C_1 < C_2,\ \rho_{12} = 0, \\ \max\{0, Q-\rho_{11}\} \le \epsilon \le \min\{\rho_{22}, Q\} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < C_1 = C_2,\ \rho_{12} = 0. \end{array} \tag{30}$$

This result implies that when $Q \in P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)})$, if $1/2 < C_1 < C_2$ and $\rho_{12} = 0$, the FRIR measurement to $P_{\rm I} = Q$ is unique. However, if $1/2 < C_1 = C_2$ and $\rho_{12} = 0$, it is not unique.

From lemma III.4, $q_0^{(0)}$ and $P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)})$ can be found in modified FRIR problem to $q_0 = \chi$ when $1/2 < C_1 \le C_2$ and $\rho_{12} \neq 0$. Here χ is as follows:

$$\chi = \frac{\chi_1 + \chi_2 - \sqrt{(\chi_1-\chi_2)^2 + 4|\gamma_{12}|^2}}{2}, \tag{31}$$

where

$$\gamma_{ij} = \frac{l^2 - e^2}{4l}\langle\nu_i|\rho_0^{-1}|\nu_j\rangle,\ \chi_i = \frac{1}{2} + \gamma_{ii} + \frac{(2q_i-1)(2C_i-1)}{2l}. \tag{32}$$

Lemma III.4 *When $\frac{1}{2} < C_1 \le C_2$ and $\rho_{12} \neq 0$, we find $q_0^{(0)} = \chi$, $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(\chi) = \frac{1+l}{2}$, and $P_{\rm I}(\chi) = 0$. Then $M_i^{\rm opt}$ to $P_{\rm I} = 0$ is expressed as*

$$M_0^{\rm opt} = 0,\ M_1^{\rm opt} = \frac{1}{2}\left[I_2 + \frac{(q_1\boldsymbol{v}_1 - q_2\boldsymbol{v}_2)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}{\|q_1\boldsymbol{v}_1 - q_2\boldsymbol{v}_2\|_2}\right],\ M_2^{\rm opt} = \frac{1}{2}\left[I_2 - \frac{(q_1\boldsymbol{v}_1 - q_2\boldsymbol{v}_2)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}{\|q_1\boldsymbol{v}_1 - q_2\boldsymbol{v}_2\|_2}\right]. \tag{33}$$

Proof. When $1/2 < C_1 \le C_2$ and $\rho_{12} \neq 0$, lemma II.2 and corollary III.1 reveal that $q_0^{(0)} < C_2$. By (ii) of optimality condition (6) and the nonnegativity of $\bar{\tau}_i(\forall i)$, $\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt} = 0$ includes $q_0 \ge C_2$, and $\bar{\tau}_{1(2)}^{\rm opt} = 0$ contains $C_{2(1)} \le 1/2$. This implies that $\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt} \neq 0(\forall i)$ if $q_0 < q_0^{(1)}$. Then $\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = 0$ means that $\bar{M}_1^{\rm opt}, \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} \neq 0$ because $\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = 0$ implies $\bar{\tau}_2^{\rm opt} = 0$ and $\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = 0$ contains $\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt} = 0$. When $\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = 0$, in order to obtain the explicit form of $\{\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}, \bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt}\}_{i=1}^2$, we use the optimality condition (8). Since $\bar{M}_0 = 0$ includes $p_0 = 0$, it has no effect on r_0 and $\boldsymbol{w}_0$. $\bar{M}_i, \bar{\tau}_i \neq 0(i=1,2)$ implies $p_i, r_i \neq 0(i=1,2)$, and by (iii) we have $\|\boldsymbol{w}_i\|_2 = 1$, $\boldsymbol{u}_i = -\boldsymbol{w}_i(i=1,2)$. Since $r_1 + r_2 = l$ and $r_2 - r_1 = q_1 - q_2$ should be satisfied by (ii), $\{p_i^{\rm opt}, \boldsymbol{u}_i^{\rm opt}\}_{i=1}^2$ and $\{r_i^{\rm opt}, \boldsymbol{w}_i^{\rm opt}\}_{i=1}^2$ can be obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p_1^{\rm opt} = p_2^{\rm opt} = \frac{1}{2},\ r_1^{\rm opt} = \frac{1+l}{2} - q_1,\ r_2^{\rm opt} = \frac{1+l}{2} - q_2, \\ \boldsymbol{u}_1^{\rm opt} = \boldsymbol{w}_2^{\rm opt} = \frac{q_1\boldsymbol{v}_1 - q_2\boldsymbol{v}_2}{\|q_1\boldsymbol{v}_1 - q_2\boldsymbol{v}_2\|_2},\ \boldsymbol{u}_2^{\rm opt} = \boldsymbol{w}_1^{\rm opt} = \frac{q_2\boldsymbol{v}_2 - q_1\boldsymbol{v}_1}{\|q_1\boldsymbol{v}_1 - q_2\boldsymbol{v}_2\|_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

From these, we find $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q) = (1+l)/2(\forall q \le q_0^{(0)})$, and can decide the explicit form of $\{M_i^{\rm opt}\}_{i=0}^2$ and $\{\tau_i^{\rm opt}\}_{i=1}^2$. However $r_0^{\rm opt}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_0^{\rm opt}$ are not decided yet. These are affected only by (ii). The triangle made of $\{q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ lies in the plane with the origin, and the triangle consisting of $\{-r_i^{\rm opt}\boldsymbol{w}_i^{\rm opt}\}_{i=0}^2$ should be located in the same plane. Since the two triangles are congruent, then as $\|r_0^{\rm opt}\boldsymbol{w}_0^{\rm opt}\|_2$ grows larger $\|q_0\boldsymbol{v}_0\|_2$ becomes larger. Since $q_0 + r_0^{\rm opt}$ is fixed as $(1+l)/2$, when $\|\boldsymbol{w}_0^{\rm opt}\|_2$ reaches the maximum(that is, when $\|\boldsymbol{w}_0^{\rm opt}\|_2 = 1$), q_0 reaches the maximum. Therefore the determinant of $\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt}$ is 0 when $q_0 = q_0^{(0)}$. From (ii), we have $(\chi_1 - q_0^{(0)})(\chi_2 - q_0^{(0)}) = |\gamma_{12}|^2$. Though there are two roots of this equation, the nonnegativity of $\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt}$ implies that $q_0^{(0)} \le \min\{\chi_1, \chi_2\}$, and the analytic form of $q_0^{(0)}$ can be obtained as χ of (31). The optimal POVM of $q_0 = \chi$ is unique since $r_i^{\rm opt} \neq 0(\forall i)$ and $\{q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ forms a triangle; see the Appendix A. This means that $\bar{P}_{\rm I}(\chi) = 0$. ■

The following theorem summarizes the previous results.

Theorem III.1 (FRIR of $Q \in P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)})$) *$q_0^{(0)}$ and $P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)})$ can be classified as follows:*

$$\begin{array}{lll} q_0^{(0)} = 1 - C_1, & P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)}) = [0, 1 - Q_2] & \text{if } \ C_1 \le \frac{1}{2} < C_2, \\ q_0^{(0)} = C_1, & P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)}) = [0, \rho_{11} + \rho_{22}\delta_{C_1,C_2}] & \text{if } \ \frac{1}{2} < C_1 \le C_2, \ \rho_{12} = 0, \\ q_0^{(0)} = \chi, & P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)}) = 0 & \text{if } \ \frac{1}{2} < C_1 \le C_2, \ \rho_{12} \neq 0. \end{array} \tag{35}$$

$R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$ becomes

$$R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q) = \begin{cases} 1 - C_1 + \frac{C_1 - q_1}{1-Q} & \text{if } \ C_1 \le \frac{1}{2} < C_2, \\ C_1 + \frac{\rho_{22}(C_2 - C_1)}{1-Q} & \text{if } \ \frac{1}{2} < C_1 \le C_2, \ \rho_{12} = 0, \\ \frac{1+l}{2} & \text{if } \ \frac{1}{2} < C_1 \le C_2, \ \rho_{12} \neq 0. \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

FRIR measurement of $P_{\rm I} = Q$ becomes, if $C_1 \le \frac{1}{2} < C_2$, (24), and if $\frac{1}{2} < C_1 \le C_2$ and $\rho_{12} = 0$, is (29), and if $\frac{1}{2} < C_1 \le C_2$ and $\rho_{12} \neq 0$, becomes (33).

C. FRIR at $P_{\rm I} = Q$ for all $Q \in P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)})^{\mathsf{C}} \cap P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(1)})^{\mathsf{C}}$

In the previous section we considered the case that the failure probability $P_{\rm I}$ is fixed as $Q \in P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)}) \cup P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(1)})$. In this section, to investigate FRIR in the other region, we classify modified FRIR problem of $q_0^{(0)} < q_0 < q_0^{(1)}$ into two cases. The first case is $C_1 \le \frac{1}{2} < C_2$ and $\rho_{12} \neq 0$, and the second one is $\frac{1}{2} < C_1 \le C_2$ and $\rho_{12} \neq 0$. Note that $\rho_{12} = 0$ is not included. It is because, from corollary III.1 and theorem III.1, when $C_1 = C_2$ and $\rho_{12} = 0$, we find $q_0^{(0)} = q_0^{(1)}$. When $C_1 < C_2$ and $\rho_{12} = 0$, we have $q_0^{(0)} < q_0^{(1)}$. However, $P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(0)}) = [0, \rho_{11}]$ and $P_{\rm I}(q_0^{(1)}) = [\rho_{11}, 1]$ implies $P_{\rm I}(q) = \rho_{11} (q_0^{(0)} < q < q_0^{(1)})$, which includes $R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(\rho_{11}) = C_2$. In addition, the following lemma tells that FRIR measurement to $P_{\rm I} = \rho_{11}$ is unique.

Lemma III.5 *When $C_1 < C_2$ and $\rho_{12} = 0$, if $q_0^{(0)} < q < q_0^{(1)}$, $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ at $q_0 = q$ can be expressed as*

$$\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \rho_{11}|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|, \ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = 0, \ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = \rho_{22}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|. \tag{37}$$

Proof. When $C_1 < C_2$ and $\rho_{12} = 0$, if $q_0^{(0)} < q < q_0^{(1)}$, POVM, defined as (37), and $\{\tau_i^\star\}_{i=0}^2$ satisfies KKT optimality condition (6) to $q_0 = q$:

$$\bar{\tau}_0^\star = (C_2 - q)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \ \bar{\tau}_1^\star = (q - C_1)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| + (2C_2 - 1)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \ \bar{\tau}_2^\star = (q - 1 + C_1)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|.$$

This means that $\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt} = \bar{\tau}_i^\star (\forall i)$. Since the rank of $\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt}$ is two, (iii) implies $\bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = 0$. However, since the rank of $\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt}$ and $\bar{\tau}_2^{\rm opt}$ are one, $\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}$ and $\bar{M}_2^{\rm opt}$ are proportional to $|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|$ and $|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|$, respectively. Therefore (i) means that $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ is unique as (37). ■

The following theorem summarizes FRIR to $\rho_{12} = 0$.

Theorem III.2 (FRIR of $\rho_{12} = 0$) *If $C_1 = C_2$, $R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$ becomes C_2 at any Q, and $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ to $P_{\rm I} = Q$ can be representes as*

$$\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \epsilon_1|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| + (Q - \epsilon_1)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = (\rho_{11} - Q)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|, \ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = (\rho_{22} - Q + \epsilon_1)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \tag{38}$$

where

$$\max\{0, Q - \rho_{22}\} \le \epsilon_1 \le \min\{\rho_{11}, Q\}. \tag{39}$$

When $C_1 < C_2$, if $0 \le Q \le \rho_{11}$, $R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$ becomes

$$R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q) = \begin{cases} 1 - C_1 + \frac{\rho_{22}(C_1 + C_2 - 1)}{1-Q} & \text{if } \ C_1 \le \frac{1}{2}, \\ C_1 + \frac{\rho_{22}(C_2 - C_1)}{1-Q} & \text{if } \ \frac{1}{2} < C_1. \end{cases} \tag{40}$$

Then $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ for $P_{\rm I} = Q$ is expressed as

$$\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = Q|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|, \ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = \epsilon_2|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|, \ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = (\rho_{11} - Q - \epsilon_2)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| + \rho_{22}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \tag{41}$$

where

$$\begin{array}{cc} \epsilon_2 = 0 & \text{if } C_1 < \frac{1}{2} < C_2, \\ 0 \le \epsilon_2 \le \rho_{11} - Q & \text{if } C_1 = \frac{1}{2} < C_2, \\ \epsilon_2 = \rho_{11} - Q & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < C_1 < C_2. \end{array} \tag{42}$$

If $\rho_{11} \le Q < 1$, $R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$ *is always* C_2, *and* $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ *to* $P_{\rm I} = Q$ *becomes*

$$\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} = \rho_{11}|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| + (Q-\rho_{11})|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|,\ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} = 0,\ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} = (1-Q)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|. \tag{43}$$

The following theorem describes modified FRIR to $\rho_{12} \neq 0$ in $q_0^{(0)} < q_0 < q_0^{(1)}$.

Theorem III.3 *When* $\rho_{12} \neq 0$ *and* $q_0^{(0)} < q < q_0^{(1)}$, *the optimal POVM to* $q_0 = q$ *is unique. Then at least one of* $M_1^{\rm opt}$ *and* $M_2^{\rm opt}$ *is nonzero. In the case of* $M_x^{\rm opt} \neq 0, M_y^{\rm opt} = 0 (\{x,y\} = \{1,2\})$, *the index* x *turns out to be the index* i *in* $\max_{i\in 1,2}[q_i + \|q\boldsymbol{v}_0 - q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\|_2]$. *In this case* $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$ *and* $P_{\rm I}(q)$ *are given as*

$$\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q) = \frac{1}{2}\left(q + q_x + \|q\boldsymbol{v}_0 - q_x\boldsymbol{v}_x\|_2\right),\ P_{\rm I}(q) = \frac{1}{2}\left[1 + \frac{(q\boldsymbol{v}_0 - q_x\boldsymbol{v}_x)\cdot\boldsymbol{v}_0}{\|q\boldsymbol{v}_0 - q_x\boldsymbol{v}_x\|_2}\right]. \tag{44}$$

The optimal POVM elements is represented as

$$M_0^{\rm opt} = \frac{1}{2}\left[I_2 + \frac{(q\boldsymbol{v}_0 - q_x\boldsymbol{v}_x)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}{\|q\boldsymbol{v}_0 - q_x\boldsymbol{v}_x\|_2}\right],\ M_x^{\rm opt} = \frac{1}{2}\left[I_2 + \frac{(q_x\boldsymbol{v}_x - q\boldsymbol{v}_0)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}{\|q\boldsymbol{v}_0 - q_x\boldsymbol{v}_x\|_2}\right],\ M_y^{\rm opt} = 0. \tag{45}$$

If $M_i^{\rm opt} \neq 0 (\forall i)$, $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$ *and* $P_{\rm I}(q)$ *become*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q) &= q + \rho_{11}\lambda_1 + \rho_{22}\lambda_2 - 2|\rho_{12}|\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}. \\ P_{\rm I}(q) &= \left[\frac{(2C_1-1)(2C_2-1) - (2q-1)^2}{2(2q-1)^2(C_1+C_2-1)}\right]\Bigg[1 - 2\rho_{11}C_1 - 2\rho_{22}C_2 \\ &\quad + \frac{|\rho_{12}|(2C_1-1)(2C_2-1)[(C_1-q)(C_2-q) + (q-1+C_1)(q-1+C_2)]}{\sqrt{(2C_1-1)(2C_2-1)(C_1-q)(C_2-q)(q-1+C_1)(q-1+C_2)}}\Bigg], \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{(2C_2-1)(C_1-q)(q-1+C_1)}{(2q-1)(C_1+C_2-1)},\ \lambda_2 = \frac{(2C_1-1)(C_2-q)(q-1+C_2)}{(2q-1)(C_1+C_2-1)}. \tag{47}$$

Then $\{\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}\}_{i=0}^2$ *is expressed as*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{M}_0^{\rm opt} &= \frac{\eta_0}{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}\left[\lambda_2|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| + \frac{\rho_{12}\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}}{|\rho_{12}|}|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_2| + \frac{\rho_{21}\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}}{|\rho_{21}|}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_1| + \lambda_1|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|\right], \\ \bar{M}_1^{\rm opt} &= \frac{\eta_1}{\lambda_1+\lambda_2+2q-1-C_1+C_2}\left[(\lambda_2+q-1+C_2)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| + \frac{\rho_{12}\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}}{|\rho_{12}|}|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_2|\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\rho_{21}\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}}{|\rho_{21}|}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_1| + (\lambda_1+q-C_1)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|\right], \\ \bar{M}_2^{\rm opt} &= \frac{\eta_2}{\lambda_1+\lambda_2+2q-1+C_1-C_2}\left[(\lambda_2+q-C_2)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1| + \frac{\rho_{12}\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}}{|\rho_{12}|}|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_2|\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\rho_{21}\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}}{|\rho_{21}|}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_1| + (\lambda_1+q-1+C_1)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|\right], \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Here η_0 *becomes* $P_{\rm I}(q)$ *of (46), and* η_1 *and* η_2 *are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_1 &= \left[\frac{(2C_1-1)(2C_2-1) + 2(C_2-C_1)(2q-1) + (2q-1)^2}{2(2q-1)^2(C_1+C_2-1)}\right] \\ &\quad \Bigg[\rho_{11}(q-1+C_1) + \rho_{22}(C_2-q) \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{|\rho_{12}|(C_2-q)(q-1+C_1)[(2C_1-1)(q-1+C_2)+(2C_2-1)(C_1-q)]}{\sqrt{(2C_1-1)(2C_2-1)(C_1-q)(C_2-q)(q-1+C_1)(q-1+C_2)}}\Bigg], \\
\eta_2 \;=\; & \left[\frac{(2C_1-1)(2C_2-1)-2(C_2-C_1)(2q-1)+(2q-1)^2}{2(2q-1)^2(C_1+C_2-1)}\right] \\
& \Bigg[\rho_{11}(C_1-q)+\rho_{22}(q-1+C_2) \\
& -\frac{|\rho_{12}|(C_1-q)(q-1+C_2)[(2C_2-1)(q-1+C_1)+(2C_1-1)(C_2-q)]}{\sqrt{(2C_1-1)(2C_2-1)(C_1-q)(C_2-q)(q-1+C_1)(q-1+C_2)}}\Bigg]. \qquad (49)
\end{aligned}
$$

Two cases are distinguished by the signs of $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^2$ *and* $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^3$. *If* $\lambda_1,\lambda_2\geq 0$ *and* $\eta_1,\eta_2,\eta_3>0$, *we have* $M_i^{\rm opt}\neq 0(\forall i)$. *Otherwise, we obtain* $M_1^{\rm opt}=0$ *or* $M_2^{\rm opt}=0$.

Proof. When $\rho_{xy}\neq 0$ and $q_0=q\in(q_0^{(0)},q_0^{(1)})$, the line intersecting $\boldsymbol{v}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_2$ does not contain the origin, and $\{q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ forms a triangle. $r_0^{\rm opt}=0$ implies that $\{M_i=\delta_{i0}I_2\}_{i=0}^2$ provide an optimal POVM, which includes $q_0^{(1)}\leq q$. Since $r_k^{\rm opt}=0(k\in\{1,2\})$ indicates that $\{M_i=\delta_{ik}I_2\}_{i=0}^2$ yields the optimal POVM, this means $q\leq q_0^{(0)}$. Therefore the element of $\{r_i^{\rm opt}\}_{i=0}^2$ are all nonzero. In this case, the optimal POVM is unique; see the Appendix A. In addition, $M_0^{\rm opt}$ is nonzero, and at least one of $M_1^{\rm opt}$ and $M_2^{\rm opt}$ is nonzero.

In the case of $M_x^{\rm opt}\neq 0, M_y^{\rm opt}=0(\{x,y\}=\{1,2\})$, the index x turns out to be the index i in $\max_{i\in 1,2}[q_i+\|q\boldsymbol{v}_0-q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\|_2]$ because $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)=\max_{i\in 1,2}[q+q_i+\|q\rho_0-q_i\rho_i\|_1]/2$. The optimal POVM, by the optimality condition (8), can be expressed as (45).

In the case of $M_i^{\rm opt}\neq 0(\forall i)$, by the optimality condition (6), $\{\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt},\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt}\}_{i=0}^2$ can be found explicitly. From condition (ii), $\{\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt}\}_{i=0}^2$ are given as follows.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt} &= \tau_{11}|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|+\tau_{12}|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_2|+\tau_{21}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_1|+\tau_{22}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \\
\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt} &= (\tau_{11}+q-C_1)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|+\tau_{12}|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_2|+\tau_{21}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_1|+(\tau_{22}+q-1+C_2)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|, \\
\bar{\tau}_2^{\rm opt} &= (\tau_{11}+q-1+C_1)|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_1|+\tau_{12}|\nu_1\rangle\langle\nu_2|+\tau_{21}|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_1|+(\tau_{22}+q-C_2)|\nu_2\rangle\langle\nu_2|.
\end{aligned}
$$

By the complementary slackness condition (iii) of (6), the every rank of $\{\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt},\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt}\}_{i=0}^2$ is one. Therefore their determinants become 0, which means

$$
|\tau_{12}|=\sqrt{\tau_{11}\tau_{22}}\quad\text{and}\quad \bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}=\mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}]\cdot\left[I_2-\frac{\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt}}{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt}]}\right]\ \forall i.
$$

Then, we have $\tau_{11}=\lambda_1$ and $\tau_{22}=\lambda_2$. Since $\mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}]$ is the probability that $M_i^{\rm opt}$ may be detected, $\mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}]$ becomes $P_{\rm I}(q)$. The phase of τ_{12} and the form of $\mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}]$ can be obtained by condition (i). The completeness condition of the POVM is represented as

$$
\frac{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}]}{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt}]}\cdot\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt}+\frac{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_1^{\rm opt}]}{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt}]}\cdot\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt}+\frac{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_2^{\rm opt}]}{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{\tau}_2^{\rm opt}]}\cdot\bar{\tau}_2^{\rm opt}=I_2-\rho_0.
$$

ρ_{12} and τ_{12} have the relation of $\rho_{12}/\tau_{12}=-\sum_{i=0}^2(\mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}]/\mathrm{tr}[\bar{\tau}_i^{\rm opt}])$. By $M_i^{\rm opt}\neq 0(\forall i)$ and the non-negativity of POVM, the right hand side of the equation is always negative, and we get $\rho_{12}/\tau_{12}=-|\rho_{12}|/|\tau_{12}|$. That is, $\tau_{12}=-(\rho_{12}/|\rho_{12}|)\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}$. And $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$ is found as (46). Then we have $\mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}]=\eta_i$ by the following relation:

$$
\begin{pmatrix}\mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_0^{\rm opt}]\\ \mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_1^{\rm opt}]\\ \mathrm{tr}[\bar{M}_2^{\rm opt}]\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}1 & 1 & 1\\ \frac{1}{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt}]} & \frac{1}{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt}]} & \frac{1}{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{\tau}_2^{\rm opt}]}\\ \frac{\lambda_1}{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt}]} & \frac{\lambda_1+q-C_1}{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt}]} & \frac{\lambda_1+q-1+C_1}{\mathrm{tr}[\bar{\tau}_2^{\rm opt}]}\end{pmatrix}^{-1}\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \frac{|\rho_{12}|}{\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}}\\ \rho_{22}\end{pmatrix}.
$$

Therefore $\bar{M}_i^{\rm opt}$ is represented as (48). The result implies the following. If $\lambda_i\geq 0(\forall i)$ and $\eta_i>0(\forall i)$, we have $M_i^{\rm opt}\neq 0(\forall i)$. Otherwise, we find $M_1^{\rm opt}=0$ or $M_2^{\rm opt}=0$. ■

The following lemma shows the result related with inconclusive degrees satisfying $M_1^{\rm opt}=0$.

Lemma III.6 *When $\rho_{12} \neq 0$, if $C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} < C_2$ and $q_0^{(0)} < q_0 < q_0^{(1)}$ (or $\frac{1}{2} < C_1 \leq C_2$ and $C_1 < q_0 < q_0^{(1)}$) can be satisfied, the optimal POVM element $M_1^{\rm opt}$ of modified FRIR problem becomes 0.*

Proof. First of all, let us consider the case of $C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} < C_2$ and $\rho_{12} \neq 0$. In the region of $q_0^{(0)} < q_0 < q_0^{(1)}$, since λ_1 of (47) is less than 0, we find $M_1^{\rm opt} = 0$ or $M_2^{\rm opt} = 0$ by theorem III.3. If $M_2^{\rm opt} = 0$, since optimality condition (6) means $\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt} = \bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt} + q_0 I_2 - \bar{\rho}_1$ and $\det(\bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt}) = \det(\bar{\tau}_1^{\rm opt}) = 0$, $t_i = \langle \nu_i | \bar{\tau}_0^{\rm opt} | \nu_i \rangle$ satisfies $t_1 t_2 = (t_1 + q_0 - C_1)(t_2 + q_0 - 1 + C_2)$. However, this result is contradictory because $(t_1 + q_0 - C_1)(t_2 + q_0 - 1 + C_2)$ is greater than $t_1 t_2$ in the region of $(C_1, 1 - C_2 \leq 1 - C_1 =) q_0^{(0)} < q_0 < q_0^{(1)}$. Therefore we get $M_1^{\rm opt} = 0$.

Next, let us consider the case of $\frac{1}{2} < C_1 \leq C_2$ and $\rho_{12} \neq 0$. Here $(q_0^{(0)}, q_0^{(1)})$ is divided into two cases: $(\chi, C_1]$ and (C_1, C_2). In latter case, because of $\lambda_1 < 0$, we can obtain $M_1^{\rm opt} = 0$. ■

To obtain $R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$, we need to express the inconclusive degree as a function of the failure probability. This task is not easy since the relation between inconclusive degree and failure probability is very complex; see $P_{\rm I}(q)$ of (44) and (46). However, it should be noted that the relation between q and $P_{\rm I}(q)$ is one-to-one, which implies that we can obtain $R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$ numerically using Eq. (11) and theorem III.3. For example, let us consider the following case of $\{q_i, \rho_i\}_{i=1}^2$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
q_1 = 0.4,\ \rho_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.15 & -0.30 + 0.10i \\ -0.30 - 0.10i & 0.85 \end{pmatrix}, \\
q_2 = 0.6,\ \rho_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.80 & -0.30 + 0.05i \\ -0.30 - 0.05i & 0.20 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{50}
$$

The Bloch vectors of the two qubit states are

$$
\boldsymbol{v}_1 = (-0.6, -0.2, -0.7) \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{v}_2 = (-0.6, -0.1, 0.6).
$$

Then, $|\rho_{12}|$, C_1, and C_2 become 0.3075, 0.8361, and 0.9657, respectively. From corollary III.1 and theorem III.1, $q_0^{(0)}$ and $q_0^{(1)}$ are $\chi = 0.6940$ and C_2, respectively. In the region of $\chi < q \leq C_1$, λ_1 and λ_2 are non-negative, and η_0 and η_2 are positive, but η_1 is not. In $\chi < q < 0.7902$, η_1 is positive. However, in $0.7902 \leq q \leq C_1$, η_1 is negative or equal to zero. Therefore, in $\chi < q_0 < 0.7902$, we find $M_i^{\rm opt} \neq 0 (\forall i)$. However, in $0.7902 \leq q_0 \leq C_1$, because of $q_1 + \|q_0 \boldsymbol{v}_0 - q_1 \boldsymbol{v}_1\|_2 < q_2 + \|q_0 \boldsymbol{v}_0 - q_2 \boldsymbol{v}_2\|_2$, we have $M_1^{\rm opt} = 0$. In addition, by lemma III.6, in $C_1 < q_0 < C_2$, $M_1^{\rm opt}$ becomes 0. Therefore if fixed failure probability $P_{\rm I}$ is $0 < P_{\rm I} < 0.5805$, we find $M_i^{\rm opt} \neq 0$. However, if $0.5805 \leq P_{\rm I} < Q_1 = 0.6635$, we have $M_0^{\rm opt} \neq 0$, $M_1^{\rm opt} = 0$, and $M_2^{\rm opt} \neq 0$. Figure 1 shows, in this example, the behavior of $P_{\rm I}(q_0)$ and $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)(R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q))$ in $q_0^{(0)} < q_0 < q_0^{(1)} (0 < Q < 1)$.

To confirm the effectiveness of our results, we consider the case of $C_1 = C_2 (= C)$ and $\rho_{12} \neq 0$. By corollary III.1 and theorem III.1, in this case, $q_0^{(0)} = \chi$ and $q_0^{(1)} = C$. If $C_1 = C_2$ is applied to $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \eta_0, \eta_1, \text{and } \eta_2$, we have the following expresssion.

$$
\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \frac{(C - q)(q - 1 + C)}{2q - 1},
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta_0 &= \frac{2}{(2q-1)^2} \Big[|\rho_{12}|(C - q)^2 + |\rho_{12}|(q - 1 + C)^2 - (C - q)(q - 1 + C) \Big], \\
\eta_1 &= \frac{(2C-1)^2 + (2q-1)^2}{2(2q-1)^2(2C-1)} \Big[\rho_{11}(q - 1 + C) + \rho_{22}(C - q) - |\rho_{12}|(2C - 1) \Big], \\
\eta_2 &= \frac{(2C-1)^2 + (2q-1)^2}{2(2q-1)^2(2C-1)} \Big[\rho_{11}(C - q) + \rho_{22}(q - 1 + C) - |\rho_{12}|(2C - 1) \Big].
\end{aligned}
$$

When $\rho_{11}, \rho_{22} \geq |\rho_{12}|$, in $\chi < q < C$, these are all positive, and we have $M_i^{\rm opt} \neq 0 (\forall i)$. Then $q_0 (= q)$ can be expressed in terms of the failure probability Q:

$$
q = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2C - 1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1 - 2|\rho_{12}|}{1 + 2|\rho_{12}| - 2Q}}. \tag{51}
$$



FIG. 1: The behavior of $P_1(q)$, $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$, and $R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$ at $\boldsymbol{v}_1 = (-0.6, -0.2, -0.7)$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_2 = (-0.6, -0.1, 0.6)$ with $q_1 = 0.4$ and $q_2 = 0.6$. We have $|\rho_{12}| = 0.3075, C_1 = 0.8361, C_2 = 0.9657$, $q_0^{(0)} = \chi = 0.6940$, and $q_0^{(1)} = C_2$. The left figure shows $P_1(q)$(solid line) and $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$(dashed-dotted line) in $q_0^{(0)} < q < q_0^{(1)}$. η_0(red dashed line) and η_2(blue dashed line) are always positive in $q_0^{(0)} < q \leq C_1$. However, η_1(green dashed line) is equal to or less than 0 in the region $0.7902 \leq q \leq C_1$. In $\chi < q_0 < 0.7902$ we get $M_i^{\rm opt} \neq 0 (\forall i)$, and in $0.7902 \leq q_0 < C_2$ we have $M_0^{\rm opt} \neq 0$, $M_1^{\rm opt} = 0$, and $M_2^{\rm opt} \neq 0$. The right figure displays the behavior of $R_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$, obtained from $P_1(q)$ and $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q)$ of the left figure. In $0 < Q < 0.5805$ we have $M_i^{\rm opt} \neq 0 (\forall i)$, and in $0.5805 \leq Q < Q_1 = 0.6635$ we get $M_0^{\rm opt} \neq 0$, $M_1^{\rm opt} = 0$, and $M_2^{\rm opt} \neq 0$.

Applying this q to $\bar{P}_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(q) - qQ$, we find $P_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$ in $0 < Q < 2|\rho_{12}|$, which agrees with the previous result:

$$P_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q) = \frac{1-Q}{2} + \frac{2C-1}{2}\sqrt{(1-2|\rho_{12}|)(1+2|\rho_{12}|-2Q)}. \tag{52}$$

When $\rho_{11} < |\rho_{12}| \leq \rho_{22}$, then $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \eta_0,$ and η_2 are always positive in the region of $\chi < q < C$; however, η_1 can be found only in the following case

$$\chi < q < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{(1-2|\rho_{12}|)(2C-1)}{2(\rho_{22}-\rho_{11})}. \tag{53}$$

In this region, like (51), q can be expressed by Q. Therefore, in the following region of the failure probability, $P_{\rm cor}^{\rm opt}(Q)$ is the same as (52), and we have $M_i^{\rm opt} \neq 0 (\forall i)$.

$$0 < Q < \frac{2(\rho_{11}\rho_{22} - |\rho_{12}|^2)}{1-2|\rho_{12}|}. \tag{54}$$

In the other region, we get $M_0^{\rm opt} \neq 0, M_1^{\rm opt} = 0$, and $M_2^{\rm opt} \neq 0$, which coincides with the previous result[33].

IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we provided a solution to the FRIR of two mixed qubit states. The solution was obtaind by considering the modified FRIR problem(MD of three qubit states). In fact, since the added specific quantum state ρ_0 with the prior probability q_0(called an conclusive degree) was obtained from the given two qubit states, the structure of the modified problem is more complex than that of the MD of three qubit states with no constraint[15]. First, we introduced special inconclusive degrees $q_0^{(0)}$ and $q_0^{(1)}$, which are the beginning and the end of proper inconclusive degrees. Using this, we divided the problem into the two cases of $q_0 = q_0^{(0)}$(or $q_0 = q_0^{(1)}$) and $q_0^{(0)} < q_0 < q_0^{(1)}$. By maximum confidences of two qubit states and non-diagonal element of ρ_0, we solved each case. We obtained $q_0^{(0)}$

and $q_0^{(1)}$ in the analytic form, and completely understood modified FRIR problem when $q_0^{(0)} \leq q_0 \leq q_0^{(1)}$. Finally, we verified that our results also provide the same solutions as known examples in the literature.

Acknowledgment

This work is supported by the Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (NRF2015R1D1A1A01060795) and Institute for Information & communications Technology Promotion(IITP) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIP) (No. R0190-15-2028, PSQKD).

Appendix A

Here we prove the following fact: When $\{q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ forms a triangle, if $r_i^{\rm opt} \neq 0(\forall i)$, then the POVM $\{M_i = p_i(I_2 + \boldsymbol{u}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})\}_{i=0}^2$ fulfilling the optimality condition (8) is unique. For the proof, we use $\boldsymbol{v}_0$ as an arbitrary Bloch vector extrinsic to $\boldsymbol{v}_1$,$\boldsymbol{v}_2$. Since $M_k^{\rm opt} = I_2$ implies $r_k^{\rm opt} = 0$, at least two of $\{M_i^{\rm opt}\}_{i=0}^2$ are nonzero.

First, we consider the case that there exists $\{p_i \neq 0, \boldsymbol{u}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ and $\{r_i \neq 0, \boldsymbol{w}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ fulfilling optimality condition (8). Without loss of generality, we can set $q_0 \geq q_1, q_2$. Then (iii) becomes $\boldsymbol{u}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{w}_i = -1(\forall i)$. This can be rewritten as $\|\boldsymbol{u}_i\|_2 = 1$, $\boldsymbol{w}_i = -\boldsymbol{u}_i(\forall i)$, and (ii) is as follows: $r_i - r_0 = e_i$, $\mathbf{R} \equiv q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i - r_i\boldsymbol{u}_i (i = 0, 1, 2)$. e_i is the difference between two prior probabilities q_0 and q_i. This condition means the following; $\{r_i\boldsymbol{u}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ forms a triangle congruent to a triangle $\{q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\}_{i=0}^2$, and $\{r_i\boldsymbol{u}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ coincides with $\{q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ by parallel transport $\mathbf{R}$. Then (i) contains the following statement. $\mathbf{R}$ lies in the interior of the triangle $\{q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\}_{i=0}^2$, and the distance from this point to the vertex of the triangle $q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i$ is r_i. The points fulfilling $r_i - r_0 = e_i$ satisfy the following hyperbolic equation:

$$r_0 = \frac{l_i^2 - e_i^2}{2(l_i \cos\theta_i + e_i)}. \tag{A1}$$

Above l_i is the distance between two vectors $q_0\boldsymbol{v}_0$ and $q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i$, and θ_i is the angle between two sides $\{\mathbf{R}, q_0\boldsymbol{v}_0\}$ and $\{q_0\boldsymbol{v}_0, q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\}$. As θ_i increases, r_0 also increases, and inside the triangle $\{q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ the position of $\mathbf{R}$ is unique. This means that the $\{p_i, \boldsymbol{u}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ are unique. Therefore, the optimal POVM in which every element is nonzero is unique. To make a distinction, we denote this POVM as $\{M_i'\}_{i=0}^2$. Suppose that there exists another POVM satifying the optimality condition and denote it as $\{M_i''\}_{i=0}^2$. Then the POVM consisting of $M_i = \epsilon M_i' + (1-\epsilon)M_i''(0 < \epsilon < 1)$ is optimal, and we have $M_i \neq 0(\forall i)$. This is contradictory, and therefore the optimal POVM is unique.

Next, we consider the case that there exist $\{p_i, \boldsymbol{u}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ and $\{r_i \neq 0, \boldsymbol{w}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ fulfilling optimality condition (8) and one of $\{p_i\}_{i=0}^2$ is zero and the others are nonzero. Without loss of generality, we can set $p_0 = 0$. Then (iii) becomes $\boldsymbol{u}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{w}_i = -1(i = 1, 2)$. This can turn into $\|\boldsymbol{u}_i\|_2 = 1$, $\boldsymbol{w}_i = -\boldsymbol{u}_i(i = 1, 2)$, and (ii) can be expressed in the following way: $r_1 - r_2 = q_2 - q_1$, $\mathbf{R} \equiv q_1\boldsymbol{v}_1 - r_1\boldsymbol{u}_1 = q_2\boldsymbol{v}_2 - r_2\boldsymbol{u}_2$. This condition implies that $\{r_i\boldsymbol{u}_i\}_{i=1}^2$ coincides with the line segment $\{q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\}_{i=1}^2$ by parallel translation $\mathbf{R}$. (i) means that $\mathbf{R}$ lies in the interior of $\{q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\}_{i=1}^2$ and the distance from the point to $q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i$ is r_i. That is, we have $r_1 + r_2 = l_{12}$. l_{12} is the distance between two vectors $q_1\boldsymbol{v}_1$ and $q_2\boldsymbol{v}_2$. Then r_1 and r_2 satisfying $r_1 - r_2 = q_2 - q_1$ are apparently unique. This implies that $\{p_i, \boldsymbol{u}_i\}_{i=1}^2$ are unique. Therefore the optimal POVM satisfing $M_0 = 0$,$M_1 \neq 0$,$M_2 \neq 0$ is unique. To differentiate from the other POVM, we represent this POVM as $\{M_i'\}_{i=0}^2$. We assume that there exists a POVM satisfying $M_0 \neq 0$ and the optimality condition, and denote it as $\{M_i''\}_{i=0}^2$. Then the POVM consisting of $M_i = \epsilon M_i' + (1-\epsilon)M_i''(0 < \epsilon < 1)$ is optimal. The result is that POVM fulfilling $M_i \neq 0(\forall i)$ and geometric optimality condition is not unique. This contradicts the previous result, and the optimal POVM is unique.

In conclusion, when $\{q_i\boldsymbol{v}_i\}_{i=0}^2$ forms a triangle and $r_i^{\rm opt} \neq 0(\forall i)$, the optimal POVM is unique.

[1] Chefles A 2000 Quantum state discrimination *Contemp. Phys.* **41** 401
[2] Barnett S M and Croke S 2009 Quantum state discrimination *Adv. Opt. Photon.* **1** 238
[3] Bergou J A 2010 Discrimination of quantum states *J. Mod. Opt.* **57** 160
[4] Bae J and Kwek L C 2015 Quantum state discrimination and its applications *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **48** 083001
[5] Helstrom C W 1976 *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic)
[6] Holevo A S 1979 *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory* (North-Holland)

[7] Yuen H P, Kennedy R S and Lax M 1975 Optimum testing of multiple hypotheses in quantum detection theory *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **21** 125

[8] Ban M, Kurokawa K, Momose R and Hirota O 1997 Optimum Measurements for Discrimination Among Symmetric Quantum States and Parameter Estimation *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **36** 1269

[9] Chou C L and Hsu L Y 2003 Minimum-error discrimination between symmetric mixed quantum states *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042305

[10] Herzog U 2004 Minimum-error discrimination between a pure and a mixed two-qubit state *J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt.* **6** S24

[11] Samsonov B F 2009 Minimum error discrimination problem for pure qubit states *Phys. Rev. A* **80** 052305

[12] Deconinck M E and Terhal B M 2010 Qubit state discrimination *Phys. Rev. A* **81** 062304

[13] Bae J and Hwang W Y 2013 Minimum-error discrimination of qubit states: Methods, solutions, and properties *Phys. Rev. A* **87** 012334.

[14] Bae J 2013 Structure of minimum-error quantum state discrimination *New. J. Phys.* **15** 073037.

[15] Ha D and Kwon Y 2013 Complete analysis for three-qubit mixed-state discrimination *Phys. Rev. A* **87** 062302

[16] Ha D and Kwon Y 2014 Discriminating N-qudit states using geometric structure *Phys. Rev. A* **90** 022330

[17] Ivanovic I D 1987 How to differentiate between non-orthogonal states *Phys. Lett. A* **123** 257

[18] Dieks D 1988 Overlap and distinguishability of quantum states *Phys. Lett. A* **126** 303

[19] Peres A 1988 How to differentiate between non-orthogonal states *Phys. Lett. A* **128** 19

[20] Jaeger G and Shimony A 1995 Optimal distinction between two non-orthogonal quantum states *Phys. Lett. A* **197** 83

[21] Rudolph T, Spekkens R W and Turner P S 2003 Unambiguous discrimination of mixed states *Phys. Rev. A* **68** 010301(R)

[22] Herzog U and Bergou J A 2005 Optimum unambiguous discrimination of two mixed quantum states *Phys. Rev. A* **71** 050301(R)

[23] Pang S and Wu S 2009 Optimum unambiguous discrimination of linearly independent pure states *Phys. Rev. A* **80** 052320

[24] Kleinmann M, Kampermann H and Bruß D 2010 Structural approach to unambiguous discrimination of two mixed quantum states *J. Math. Phys.* **51** 032201

[25] Sugimoto H, Hashimoto T, Horibe M and Hayashi A 2010 Complete solution for unambiguous discrimination of three pure states with real inner products *Phys. Rev. A* **82** 032338

[26] Bergou J A, Futschik U and Feldman E 2012 Optimal Unambiguous Discrimination of Pure Quantum States *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** 250502

[27] Ha D and Kwon Y 2015 Analysis of optimal unambiguous discrimination of three pure quantum states *Phys. Rev. A* **91** 062312

[28] Croke S, Andersson E, Barnett S M, Gilson C R and Jeffers J 2006 Maximum confidence quantum measurements *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96** 070401

[29] Chefles A and Barnett S M 1998 Strategies for discriminating between non-orthogonal quantum states *J. Mod. Opt.* **45** 1295

[30] Zhang C W, Li C F and Guo G C 1999 General strategies for discrimination of quantum states *Phys. Lett. A* **261** 25

[31] Fiurášek J and Ježek M 2003 Optimal discrimination of mixed quantum states involving inconclusive results *Phys. Rev. A* **67** 012321

[32] Eldar Y C 2003 Mixed-quantum-state detection with inconclusive results *Phys. Rev. A* **67** 042309

[33] Herzog U 2012 Optimal state discrimination with a fixed rate of inconclusive results: Analytical solutions and relation to state discrimination with a fixed error rate *Phys. Rev. A* **86** 032314

[34] Bagan E, Muoz-Tapia R, Olivares-Rentera G A and Bergou J A 2012 Optimal discrimination of quantum states with a fixed rate of inconclusive outcomes *Phys. Rev. A* **86** 040303(R)

[35] Nakahira K, Usuda T S and Kato K 2015 Finding optimal measurements with inconclusive results using the problem of minimum error discrimination *Phys. Rev. A* **91** 022331

[36] Herzog U 2015 Optimal measurements for the discrimination of quantum states with a fixed rate of inconclusive results *Phys. Rev. A* **91** 042338

[37] Eldar Y C, Megretski A and Verghese G C 2003 Designing optimal quantum detectors via semidefinite programming *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **49** 1007

[38] Boyd S and Vandenberghe L 2004 *Convex Optimization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)